

RAFINESQUE TYPES IN THE GROUP OF *ACALYPHA VIRGINICA*.—Undoubtedly the best set of Rafinesque specimens in existence is at Geneva. A letter of De Candolle, there preserved, states that he had received, at the time of writing, eight cases of dried plants from Rafinesque; and there may, of course, have been others. Apparently, De Candolle did not keep them in his own collection; at least, all the sheets of *Acalypha* I could find are in the Delessert Herbarium, where, through the kindness of Professor Hochreutiner, I was permitted, last summer, to search for such as might throw light on the identity of Rafinesque's species in the group of *A. virginica*, a revision of which I published in 1927.¹

The specimens found do not place all of Rafinesque's names, but, so far as they go, they are reassuring. There are five in all. They show that he applied the name *A. virginica* to *A. gracilens* Gray; one of his two sheets of that species is so labelled. Gray's name, therefore, is not threatened. There are two specimens of *A. rhomboidea*, labelled by Rafinesque himself with an epithet slightly different from *rhomboidea* as published, but with the same meaning, and quite certainly representing that species. One is from Arkansas, one from South Carolina. Both are small-leaved phases, and the former also has unusually long-stalked staminate spikes; but they can be matched in any considerable series of specimens and in technical characters both unquestionably belong with *A. virginica* var. α Muell. Arg., *A. rhomboidea* of my latest treatment. My use of the latter name is confirmed. I should designate the South Carolina specimen as type since it more nearly approximates the usual conditions in the species.

There is a third specimen, of large-leaved *A. rhomboidea*, named to genus only. This may represent *A. urticifolia* Raf. New Fl. i. 45 (1836). If so, it is not my *A. rhomboidea*, var. *Deamii*, as I had feared might be the case, and that name also stands clear.

There is nothing to represent either *A. digyneia*, which presumably rests wholly on Robin's description, or the three other North American species, which must remain of dubious identity.—C. A. WEATHERBY, Gray Herbarium.

¹ RHODORA, xxix. 193–204 (1927); also RHODORA, xl. 14–16 (1938).

Volume 42, no. 494, including pages 25–56 and plate 588, was issued 6 February, 1940.